



Application by Mona Offshore Wind Limited for Mona Offshore Wind Farm
The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)
Issued on 13 September 2024

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information - ExQ1. If necessary, the examination timetable enables the ExA to issue a further round of written questions in due course. If this is done, the further round of questions will be referred to as ExQ2.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues provided as Appendix C to the Rule 6 letter of 7 June 2024. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with 1 (indicating that it is from ExQ1) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on air quality is identified as Q1.1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the case team: please contact monaoffshorewindproject@planninginpectorate.gov.uk and include Mona Offshore Wind Farm in the subject line of your email.

Responses are due by Deadline 3: Monday 30 September 2024.

Abbreviations used:

AEoI	Adverse Effect on Integrity	NATS	National Air Traffic Services
AIL	Abnormal Indivisible Load	NPS	National Policy Statement
AONB	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	NRW (A)	Natural Resources Wales (Advisory)
AyM	Awel y Môr	NRW (MLT)	Natural Resources Wales (Marine Licensing Team)
BoR	Book of Reference	NWWT	North Wales Wildlife Trust
CA	Compulsory Acquisition	NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
CBBC	Conwy County Borough Council	OCoCP	Outline Code of Construction Practice
CEA	Cumulative Effects Assessment	OCMS	Outline Construction Method Statement
CO₂	Carbon Dioxide	ODMP	Outline Dust Management Plan
CRDV	Clwydian Range and Dee Valley	OSEP	Outline Skills and Employment Plan
CSIP	Cable Specification and Installation Plan	OWF	Offshore Wind Farm
dDCO	Draft Development Consent Order	ONVMP	Outline Noise and Vibration Management Plan
DCC	Denbighshire County Council	OLEMP	Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan
DCLG	Department for Communities and Local Government	OSMP	Outline Soil Management Plan
DCO	Development Consent Order	PA2008	Planning Act 2008
DML	Deemed Marine Licence	PPW	Planning Policy Wales
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment	PRoW	Public Rights of Way
EM	Explanatory Memorandum	PSR	Primary Surveillance Radar
EMF	Electromagnetic Fields	R	Requirement
EMP	Environmental Management Plan	RR	Relevant Representation
ENP	Eryri National Park	RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
ES	Environmental Statement	SAC	Special Area of Conservation
ExA	Examining Authority	Sch	Schedule
FCA	Flood Consequence Assessment	SGLP	Special Category Land Plans
GCN	Great Crested Newts	SLVIA	Seascape, Landscape and Visual Impact
GW	Gigawatts	SMZ	Scallop Mitigation Zone
		SoCG	Statement(s) of Common Ground



HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle	SoS	Secretary of State
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment	SoR	Statement of Reasons
IoA	Isle of Anglesey	SPA	Special Protection Area
IoACC	Isle of Anglesey County Council	tCO₂e	Tonnes of CO ₂ equivalent
IoANL	Isle of Anglesey National Landscape	TP	Temporary Possession
IoMG	Isle of Man Government	UXO	Unexploded Ordnance
JNCC	Joint Nature Conservation Committee	VP	Viewpoint
km	kilometres	WR	Written Representation
LIR	Local Impact Report		
LSE	Likely Significant Effect		
LPA	Local Planning Authority		
LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment		
m	metres		
MCA	Maritime and Coastguard Agency		
MDS	Maximum Design Scenario		
MHWS	Mean High Water Springs		
MMP	Materials Management Plan		
MNEF	Marine Navigation Engagement Forum		

The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010137/EN010137-000519-Mona%20Offshore%20Wind%20farm%20-%20Bilingual%20Examination%20Library.pdf>

It will be updated as the examination progresses.



Index

1.0	General and Cross Topic Questions	5
1.1	Air Quality and Human Health	6
1.2	Construction	8
1.3	Civil and Military Aviation and Defence Interests	10
1.4	Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	12
1.5	Commercial Fisheries, Fish and Shellfish.....	13
1.6	Compulsory Acquisition (CA) and Temporary Possession (TP).....	14
1.7	Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)	20
1.8	Flood Risk and Water Environment	22
1.9	Geology and Ground Conditions	23
1.10	Habitats Regulations Assessment	23
1.11	Historic Environment	27
1.12	Land Use	28
1.13	Landscape and Visual and Good Design	29
1.14	Marine and Coastal Physical Processes and Coastal Change	33
1.15	Navigation and Shipping.....	34
1.16	Noise and Vibration.....	39
1.17	Offshore Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment	40
1.18	Onshore Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment	44
1.19	Other Offshore Infrastructure and Activities	49
1.20	Seascape and Visual Resources	52
1.21	Socio-economics.....	56
1.22	Traffic and Transport	58

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.0 General and Cross Topic Questions		
	The Applicant IGP Solar 21 Limited	<p>Cumulative effects</p> <p>[AS-23] from IGP Solar 21 Limited refers to the proposed construction of a battery storage facility on land at Pentre Mawr which would overlap with Works Nos 25 and 26 for the Mona OWF.</p> <p>Applicant: Will the proposed development be brought into the CEA?</p> <p>IGP Solar 21 Limited: What details are you able to submit, including anticipated timescales, into the Examination?</p>
Q1.0.1	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects</p> <p>In [REP1-011] (Table 1.17), it states that a review of recently published material in relation to proposed offshore wind farms in the west Irish Sea are currently being undertaken, in light of the submissions from Meath County Council [OD-021].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When will this review be completed? • Record any changes in an updated version of [APP-084].
Q1.0.2	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects</p> <p>Whilst the ExA notes the provision of a Cumulative Effects Screening Matrix, it would assist if a table that presents an assessment of cumulative impacts including the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development with 3rd party developments was provided. The ExA would point the Applicant to [APP-177] of the Drax Carbon Capture and Storage Project as an example.</p>
Q1.0.3	The Applicant NRW (A)	<p>NRW SoCG (Offshore)</p> <p>Table 1.4 of [REP1-022] indicates that the SoCG being progressed with NRW (A) in relation to offshore matters covers 11 topics. However, REP1-025 only covers 7 of these topics.</p>

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can the Applicant and NRW confirm whether or not the topics of commercial fisheries, shipping and navigation, marine archaeology and other sea users are to be included in any NRW SoCG?
Q1.04	The Applicant	<p>Welsh National Marine Plan</p> <p>Can the Applicant summarise how it meets the policy aim of Welsh National Marine Plan underwater noise (ENV_05) to monitor and collect evidence to improve understanding of areas of concern such as drilling and pilling, and seismic surveys including the use of sonar.</p>
Q1.05	The Applicant	<p>Welsh National Marine Plan</p> <p>Can the Applicant summarise how it meets the policy aim of Welsh National Marine Plan that biological and geological components of ecosystems are maintained, restored where needed and enhanced where possible, to increase the resilience of marine ecosystems and the benefits they provide.</p>
Q1.06	The Applicant DCC, CCBC, NRW(A)	<p>Other Consents or Licenses Required [APP-085]</p> <p>Can respective parties give a progress update on the licences and consents and advise if there are any that raise concerns that may lead to refusal.</p>
1.1 Air Quality and Human Health		
Q1.1.1	Health & Safety Executive	<p>Health & Safety</p> <p>The Applicant responded to comments in your RR [RR-025] in ([PDA-008], page 173). Does this address your concerns?</p>
Q1.1.2	CCBC	<p>Heat radiation</p> <p>In [PDA-008], page 24, the Applicant engaged with your perceived need for assessment of potential impacts of heat radiation on human health [RR-009]. In light of that, and the WR from Public Health Wales [REP1-058], does that alter your position?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.1.3	The Executors of the Late Sir David Watkin Williams-Wynn. Bt.	<p>Electro-Magnetic Fields (EMFs)</p> <p>The Applicant addressed comments in your RR [RR-082] about the potential impact of EMFs in [PDA-008], page 173. In Section 4.2 of ES Chapter 4 (Vol 4) [APP-078] it signposted the proposal's potential impact on human health had been assessed against the prevailing legislative and policy context and specifically addressed the perception of risk for EMF (radiation), both individually and cumulatively, at Sections 4.8.8 and 4.10.8 respectively. In light of that, and the WR from Public Health Wales [REP1-058], does that address your concerns? If not, please explain why.</p>
Q1.1.4	Public Health Wales	<p>Current position</p> <p>In your WR [REP1-058] you refer to '<i>points raised in our previous response</i>'. However, your RR [RR-067] refers only to registration as an IP and involvement in the Examination process. Please advise whether on the basis of the evidence to date, in particular ES Chapter 4 (Vol 4) [APP-078], you currently have any objection to or concerns with the Proposed Development?</p>
Q1.1.5	CCBC	<p>Scope of concerns</p> <p>In [PDA-008], page 23 the Applicant addressed your perceived need for mitigation measures for dust. As the only mention of dust in your LIR [REP1-049] was in relation to construction impacts on vegetation, can you advise if the Applicant's proposed mitigation measures relating to dust in general are considered acceptable?</p>
Q1.1.6	Michael & Sally Leach, Mr & Mrs JT Owen	<p>Dust</p> <p>In [PDA-008], pages 242 & 252 the Applicant highlighted its proposals for mitigating the potential impacts of dust and submitted an updated ODMF at Deadline 2 [REP2-042]. If you consider these proposals to be inadequate, can you advise how they need to be supplemented?</p>
Q1.1.7	CCBC	<p>Lighting</p> <p>What do you mean by a '<i>proportionate assessment of lighting impacts</i>' [REP1-049]; what sites, factors etc should the Applicant take account of?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.2 Construction		
Q12.1	The Applicant	<p>Materials Management Plan</p> <p>ES Chapter 3 (Vol 1) paragraph 3.12.1.3 [APP-050] states that in addition to a Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP), a MMP would be prepared and agreed prior to commencement of earthworks. In the Outline SWMP [APP-221], paragraph 1.4.2.12, mention is made of the MMP being prepared post consent. Can you clarify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • when it would be prepared and agreed; • whether it is intended to be relied on as mitigation; and • if so, how it would be secured?
Q12.2	Michael & Sally Leach, Mr & Mrs JT Owen	<p>Soil Storage & Management</p> <p>In [PDA-008], pages 242 & 255, the Applicant identified proposed measures associated with soil storage and management and submitted an updated Outline Soil Management Plan at Deadline 2 [REP2-054]. If you consider these proposals to be inadequate, can you advise how they need to be supplemented?</p>
Q12.3	Michael & Sally Leach	<p>Construction effects</p> <p>In [REP2-078], REP1-087.3, 4, 5 & 6, the Applicant responded to your submissions about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Proposed Development's potential impact on your property's existing utility and private service media; and • perceived lack of detail in submitted documentation and in respect of specified elements of the proposed works. <p>With reasoning for your conclusion, does this address your concerns?</p>
Q12.4	Mr & Mrs JT Owen	<p>Construction effects</p> <p>In [REP2-078], REP1-088.3 & 4, the Applicant responded to your submissions about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Proposed Development's potential impact on your property's existing utility and private service media; and

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> perceived lack of detail in submitted documentation and in respect of specified elements of the proposed works. <p>With reasoning for your conclusion, does this address your concerns?</p>
Q125	The Applicant	<p>OCoCP [REP2-038]</p> <p>Can you advise why “general accordancy” rather than in accordance has been used within paragraphs 1.3.1.4, 1.5.1.3 and 1.7.6.1 of the OCoCP in relation to the final CoCP and the final LCMS and OCMS.</p>
Q126	The Applicant	<p>OCoCP [REP2-038]</p> <p>Section 1.7.4 refers to Principal Contractor and that its Environmental Management System would provide the process and would set out monitor compliance and effectiveness of the measures included in the CoCP. Paragraph 1.7.5.2 refers to management measures would be updated where necessary in discussion with the relevant planning authority. Can you clarify when updates are undertaken whether any Principal Contractor management plans would also be updated and issued to the relevant planning authority.</p>
Q127	The Applicant	<p>OCoCP [REP2-038]</p> <p>Paragraph 1.8.2.2 refers to activities that may be undertaken during the mobilisation period. Can the Applicant summarise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the typical tasks and plant involved with site maintenance; and ii) advise on the noise levels (dBA) associated with safety checking of plant and machinery.
Q128	The Applicant	<p>OCoCP [REP2-038]</p> <p>For extended working hours (paragraph 1.8.2.4), reference is made to time critical activities. As these activities are high level and lack detail can the Applicant explain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) how time critical high level activities are developed into detail and shared with the relevant planning authority and the local community; ii) why advance notice to the relevant planning authority (for activities at the Onshore substation) is limited to not less than 48hrs; and

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		iii) what is meant by a programme of safety critical operations.
Q12.9	The Applicant	<p>OCoCP [REP2-038]</p> <p>Paragraph 1.8.2.5 states that emergency works may also be undertaken outside of the core working hours. Can the Applicant confirm if emergency works are those related to procedures for storing and handling potential pollutants during construction, and controlling and managing spillages, or are emergency works safety critical operations.</p>
Q12.10	The Applicant	<p>OOCMS [REP2-068]</p> <p>Can you provide a draft annotated layout plan of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the primary temporary construction compound; and ii) the onshore substation temporary construction compound.
1.3 Civil and Military Aviation and Defence Interests		
Q13.1	Defence Infrastructure Organisation The Applicant	<p>Effects on air traffic control radar at BAE Warton</p> <p>The ExA notes that the parties are actively engaging to agree a mitigation solution for potential effects on air traffic control radar at BAE Warton [REP2-089]. Given that agreement with a number of other operational and proposed OWFs is contingent upon the outcome of those discussions, the ExA requests that any progress toward agreement with the Defence Infrastructure Organisation is reported to the Examination at the earliest opportunity.</p>
Q13.2	Defence Infrastructure Organisation	<p>Physical Obstruction to Aircraft</p> <p>Can the Defence Infrastructure Organisation provide a plan showing the extent of Low Flying Area 17, as referred to in [REP1-054]?</p>
Q13.3	Defence Infrastructure Organisation	<p>Aviation lighting scheme</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Further to submissions in [REP1-054] and [REP2-089], is the Defence Infrastructure Organisation in agreement with the wording of Requirement 3 of the draft Development Consent Order [REP2-004], Schedule 2 ('Aviation safety') or are any amendments to the drafting sought?</p>
Q1.3.4	The Applicant	<p>Ronaldsway Airport Primary Surveillance Radar</p> <p>The ExA notes submissions [REP1-010] that Ronaldsway Airport is currently undertaking a wider surveillance strategy in light of proposals in the Irish Sea and that there may be a dependency between potential mitigation solutions for Ronaldsway Airport Primary Surveillance Radar (PSR) and discussions currently underway with NATS (En Route) plc.</p> <p>In light of the findings in [APP-075], the ExA encourages the Applicant to make all endeavours with Ronaldsway Airport to clarify and confirm the position on mitigation by Deadline 7 at the latest in order that the ExA can report fully on the matter. This should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what form the mitigation would take; • how and by whom it would be implemented; and • how it is secured, including the wording for any DCO Requirement.
Q1.3.5	The Applicant	<p>Liverpool Airport Primary Surveillance Radar</p> <p>The ExA notes the Applicant's submissions (summarised in [REP1-010], ID 7b) that Liverpool Airport is not actively engaged in discussions on potential interference with PSR and mitigation. Nevertheless, [APP-075] identifies a moderate adverse effect in respect of Liverpool Airport PSR which, in the absence of further mitigation, represents a significant effect in EIA terms.</p> <p>The ExA therefore encourages the Applicant to make all endeavours with Liverpool Airport to clarify and confirm the position on mitigation by Deadline 7 at the latest in order that the ExA can report fully on the matter. This should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • what form the mitigation would take; • how and by whom it would be implemented; and

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> how it is secured, including the wording for any DCO Requirement.
Q1.3.6	The Applicant	<p>Liverpool Airport Primary Surveillance Radar</p> <p>[REP1-010], ID 7b states that “<i>any mitigation put in place for NATS would potentially apply to Liverpool Airport as well</i>”. Can the Applicant provide an update as to the extent to which the mitigation solution currently under discussion with NATS would mitigate predicted effects on Liverpool Airport PSR?</p>
Q1.3.7	Moor Vannin Offshore Wind Farm Limited (MVOWFL)	<p>Cumulative effects on Primary Surveillance Radar</p> <p>The Applicant responded to your Relevant Representation in [PDA-008], Table 2.45, ID RR-045.8.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With reference to [APP-075], is MVOWFL satisfied that the Applicant’s assessment has correctly assessed the potential project alone and cumulative effects on PSR? Does MVOWFL wish to make any further submissions in relation to the assessment or mitigation of potential interference with PSR?
1.4	Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	
Q1.4.1	The Applicant	<p>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</p> <p>In [APP-076] section 2.10.4, the impact of greenhouse gas emissions arising from the manufacturing and installation of the generation and transmission assets during construction is considered to result in a moderate adverse effect, reduced to minor adverse after secondary/further mitigation.</p> <p>It is stated that the Applicant is committed to exploring options to reduce construction-related emissions and examples are provided of potential measures and that those measures are expected to be included in the relevant final management plans. What does the term ‘expected’ mean and how can the ExA be confident that the further mitigation is secured and would result in the predicted reduced effect?</p>
Q1.4.2	The Applicant	<p>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</p> <p>In [APP-076] Section 2.10.8.2, the net lifetime saving in CO₂ emissions for the Mona Offshore Wind Farm Project is stated as -129,466 tCO₂e of avoided emissions.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you comment on the possibility of the construction emissions being greater than the operational emission saved if the actual generating capacity of the installed turbined was to be less than 1.5GW? • Should the assessment be updated to reflect the uncertainty around the exact generating capacity and the technology to be used for the turbines?
1.5 Commercial Fisheries, Fish and Shellfish		
Q1.5.1	The Applicant	<p>Applicant’s Response to Written Representation [REP2-078]</p> <p>The Applicant’s response to REP1-075.10 [REP2-078] states that it will commit to maintaining a Scallop Mitigation Zone (SMZ) of 57 km2 by including this commitment within an update to Table 1.2 of the Outline FLCP [APP-199] at Deadline 3. As the size is much smaller in area than what the Scottish Fishermen’s Federation, the Scottish Whitefish Producers Association Ltd and the West Coast Sea Products expected can the Applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) summarise the steps it took to evaluate smaller and larger sizes and how a 57 km2 SMZ area size was selected; ii) clarify if rock protection footprint for cables would have an impact on the size of the 57 km2 SMZ; and iii) explain what the effects would be on the Proposed Development if it increased the SMZ by 20-25% in area size.
Q1.5.2	The Applicant	<p>Applicant’s Response to Written Representation [REP2-078]</p> <p>The Applicant’s response to written representations reference REP1-081.4 [REP2-078] states the SMZ covers approximately 37% of scallop grounds located within the Mona Array Area. In its written representation West Coast Sea Products [REP1-081] highlighted that the overall cumulative effect with the proposed Morgan Offshore windfarm would effects 53% of 2023 Queen data.</p> <p>Can you summarise your position regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the effects of potential loss of revenue on scallop fishery when compared to 2023 queen data, and whether it would change the conclusion of your assessment; and

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		ii) if any further mitigation measures could be added to the Outline Fisheries Liaison and Co-Existence Plan.
Q1.5.3	The Applicant NRW(A) JNCC NWWT	<p>ES Chapter 3 (Vol 2) Fish and Shellfish Ecology [APP-055]</p> <p>There does not appear to be any information on wind turbine sound emissions nor vessels sound emissions during operation in section 3.9.3. Table 3.6 states that it has been scoped out based on site specific sound information, including modelling of sound emissions from the proposed wind turbines and vessels and effects on fish and shellfish receptors as detailed in section 3.9.3.</p> <p>The Planning Inspectorate did not agree that operational noise of the OWF can be scoped out of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Can the Applicant provide the information stated in Table 3.6 on wind turbine sound emissions and vessels; and</p> <p>Can respective parties advise if they have any concerns regarding potential underwater sound during the operational phase impacting fish and shellfish receptors.</p>
Q1.5.4	The Applicant	<p>Monitoring</p> <p>NPS EN-3 requires Applicants to develop an ecological monitoring programme to monitor impacts during the pre-construction, construction and operational phases to identify the actual impacts caused by the project and compare them to what was predicted in the EIA/HRA. Can the Applicant summarise how it has met this requirement for Scallops?</p>
1.6 Compulsory Acquisition (CA) and Temporary Possession (TP)		
The ExA intends on holding a Compulsory Acquisition Hearing on 17 and 18 October 2024 where it will have further questions.		
Q1.6.1	The Applicant	<p>BoR</p> <p>Are you satisfied that that the address given in the BoR [REP2-008] for Hefin Williams [RR-026] is correct?</p>
Q1.6.2	Hefin Williams	BoR

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Can you confirm that you have a legal interest in the following plots shown in the BoR [REP2-008] and Land Plan (Onshore) [REP1-004]: 04-069, 04-070, 04-071, 04-072, 04-073, 04-074, 04-075, 04-076 and 04-077?
Q1.6.3	Hefin Williams	BoR Does the BoR [REP2-008] need to be changed to correctly reflect your legal interest in land subject of the Proposed Development? If so, how?
Q1.6.4	Lois Williams	BoR Does the BoR [REP2-008] need to be changed to include land within the Order Limits of the Proposed Development, as shown on the Land Plan (Onshore) [REP1-004] or the Works Plan – Onshore [AS-003], in which you have a legal interest? If so, how?
Q1.6.5	G Lloyd Evans & Sons H L & RJL Evans	BoR Does the farm subject of your written submission [REP2-103] comprise only land in the BoR [REP2-008], and shown on the Land Plan (Onshore) [REP1-004], that is registered to Robert John Lloyd Evans? If not, please list the Plot Nos. that are comprised within the holding and/or annotate an extract from the relevant Land Plan(s).
Q1.6.6	Any AP	BoR Are you aware of any inaccuracies in the BoR [REP2-008], SoR [APP-029], Land Plan (Onshore) [REP1-004], Crown Land Plan (Onshore) [AS-006] or Special Category Land Plan [AS-007]? If so, set out what these are and provide the correct details.
Q1.6.7	The Applicant	Category 3 persons At Section 11 b of the BoR [REP2-008] you explain the rationale for listing “Category 3” persons in Part 2 thereof. Can you: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • either signpost or explain the methodology you used in identifying such persons? and

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • explain why the owners of Tyddyn Meredydd, Cefn, St Asaph and Cae Llywd, Cefn, St Asaph were included but not that of Pentre Meredydd, which is located between the two?
Q1.6.8	The Applicant	<p>Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)</p> <p>Paragraphs 27 and 28 of 'Planning Act 2008 Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land', September 2013, Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), state that applicants are urged to consider offering full access to ADR techniques for those with concerns about CA of their land. Have you done so or considered other means of involving those affected? If so, give details.</p>
Q1.6.9	The Applicant	<p>Alternatives</p> <p>In light of the DCLG guidance, in particular paragraph 8, can you:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advise how the Secretary of State can be assured that all reasonable alternatives to CA (including modifications to the scheme) have been explored; and • Set out in summary form, with document references where appropriate, what assessment / comparison has been made of the alternatives to the proposed acquisition of land or interests in each case.
Q1.6.10	CCBC DCC	<p>Land rights</p> <p>In your role as the local planning authority and the highway authority, are you aware of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any reasonable alternatives to the CA or TP which is sought by the Applicant? • Any areas of land or rights that the Applicant is seeking the powers to acquire that you consider would not be needed?
Q1.6.11	The Applicant	<p>Temporary possession</p> <p>Section 1.10.1.19 of the SoR [APP-029] says that temporary possession powers apply to all of the Order Land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the dDCO provide for this? • The Annotation on the Land Plan (Onshore) is consistent with this statement but seemingly at odds with Table 1 of the Book of Reference [AS-015] where temporary possession / occupation is not

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>mentioned in respect of the rows relating to land coloured Pink, Blue and Green on the Land Plans. Given that, by virtue of Schedule 15 of the dDCO [REP2-004] both documents are to be certified, can you reconcile this apparent inconsistency?</p>
Q1.6.12	The Applicant	<p>Clarification In the SoR [APP-029] you say at paragraph 1.11.1.18 that: <i>'Permanent access rights to access the cable corridor are sought over Plots [xx].'</i> Can you address this omission.</p>
Q1.6.13	CCBC DCC	<p>Open Space In paragraphs 1.11.1.8 to 1.11.1.20 inclusive of the SoR [APP-029], the Applicant sets why it considers that any granting of development consent would not be subject to Special Parliamentary Procedure given that 'open space' within the Order land, when burdened with the order right, would be no less advantageous than it was before to: (a) the persons in whom it is vested; (b) other persons, if any, entitled to rights of common or other rights; and (c) the public, in accordance with s132(3) of PA2008. With reasoning for your position, are you are satisfied with this conclusion?</p>
Q1.6.14	The Applicant CCBC DCC	<p>Open Space Notwithstanding the conclusion at paragraph 1.11.1.20 of the SoR [APP-029], is the Proposed Development consistent with s132(3) of PA2008 given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The length of time during which the Open Space at Pensarn/Abergele Beach, shown on the Special Category Land Plan [AS-007], could be subject to TP: • The potential for conflict between its proposed use and movements by visiting motorists, pedestrians and cyclists using the informal parking area, beach, promenade, cycle and coast paths; and • The proposed fencing of Plot 01-003, the uses subject of Work No.7 and further associated development set out in Schedule 1, Part 1 of the dDCO [REP2-004].
Q1.6.15	The Applicant	<p>Gwrych Castle At paragraph 1.11.1.6 of the SoR [APP-029] reference was made to further survey work during the pre-Application period on Welsh Government land and to on-going negotiations in respect of land rights required over operational and non-operational extents of the A55 and an area of woodland at Gwrych</p>

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Castle. What progress has been made on those outstanding matters and do you envisage the need for any associated change to the Application in respect of land rights?
Q1.6.16	NFU Davis Meade Property Consultants The Executors of the Late Sir David Watkin Williams- Wynn. Bt. Mr & Mrs JT Owen Any AP	Policy context Do paragraphs 2.6.4 and 2.6.5 of NPS EN-5 provide policy support for the Applicant's approach to the compulsory acquisition of land?
Q1.6.17	NFU Davis Meade Property Consultants	dDCO provisions In respect of your concerns about rights in land that the Applicant seeks ([PDA-048] and [REP1-082] respectively), with reference to the dDCO [REP2-004], can you suggest the specific wording of amendments or additions to its provisions that would address them?
Q1.6.18	Davis Meade Property Consultants	Update In its Response to WRs [REP2-078] the Applicant responded to your WR [REP1-082]. With reasoning for your conclusion on each of the issues, does this address your concerns?
Q1.6.19	NFU Any AP	Discharge of Water and Field Drainage In its Response to Written Submissions made at Procedural Deadline ([REP1-011], pages 32 & 33) the Applicant addressed concerns about perceived lack of detail as to management of surface water run-off and provision for field drainage [PDA-048]. With reasoning for your conclusion, does this allay your concerns?
Q1.6.20	NFU Any AP	Soil management and reinstatement In its Response to Written Submissions made at Procedural Deadline ([REP1-011], pages 32 & 33) the Applicant addressed concerns about soil management and reinstatement [PDA-048] and it also

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		submitted a revised Outline Soil Management Plan at Deadline 2 [REP2-054]. With reasoning for your conclusion, does this allay your concerns?
Q1.6.21	NFU Any AP	Outline code of construction In its Response to Written Submissions made at Procedural Deadline ([REP1-011], pages 31 & 32) the Applicant signposted where it has made provision for the matters raised under the heading 'Outline Code of Construction' in the NFU submission [PDA-048]. With reasoning for your conclusion, does this allay your concerns?
Q1.6.22	The Applicant	Enabling Works In your Response to Written Submissions made at Procedural Deadline ([REP1-011], page 31) you referred to possible mitigation works to reduce disturbance to farming practices; how would these be secured through the dDCO?
Q1.6.23	The Executors of the Late Sir David Watkin Williams-Wynn. Bt.	Clarification In your WR [REP1-091] you referred to other schemes where acquisition of land within your ownership was by lease; what NSIPs are you referring to?
Q1.6.24	The Executors of the Late Sir David Watkin Williams-Wynn. Bt.	Alternatives In your RR [RR-082] you refer to ' <i>other sensible alternatives</i> ' for the proposed access route. Can you show these on a map or plan?
Q1.6.25	The Executors of the Late Sir David Watkin Williams-Wynn. Bt.	Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent does the Applicant's response ([PDA-008], pages 334-339 and [REP2-078] to the matters you raised in you RR ([RR-082] and WR [REP1-091] address your concerns? Can you provide an update on negotiations with the Applicant?
Q1.6.26	Tan-y-Mynydd Trout Fishery The Applicant	Alternative route In the WR [REP1-080] mention is made of the ' <i>alternative route to the immediate North of the fishery</i> '. With reference to the relevant documents in the Examination Library, please signpost where this was identified and considered.

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.6.27	Iwan Roberts	<p>Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the Applicant's response ([PDA-008], pages 180-182) to the matters you raised in your RR [RR-089] address your concerns? • Can you provide an update on negotiations with the Applicant?
Q1.6.28	G Lloyd Evans & Sons The Applicant	<p>Alternatives</p> <p>The written submission [REP2-103] refers to 2 proposed routes put forward in 2022, that are referred to as '<i>the northern route</i>' and '<i>the southern route</i>'. With reference to the relevant documents in the Examination Library, please signpost where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • these were identified and considered; and • alternative potential construction methods evaluated.
Q1.6.29	Michael & Sally Leach	<p>Update</p> <p>In its Response to Written Representations ([REP2-078], REP1-087.1) the Applicant responded to your submission about compensation. With reasoning for your conclusion, does this address your concerns?</p>
Q1.6.30	Mrs & Mrs JT Owen	<p>Update</p> <p>In its Response to Written Representations ([REP2-078], REP1-082.2 & 5) the Applicant responded to your submission about the proposed extent of interference with your land rights and associated compensation. With reasoning for your conclusion, does this address your concerns?</p>
<p>1.7 Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)</p>		
<p>The ExA has a limited number of questions at this time as an Issue Specific Hearing on the dDCO will be held on 24 October 2024 where it will be examined in further detail.</p>		
Q1.7.1	The Applicant	<p>Article 8</p> <p>In line with section 5.11.25 of NSIP Advice Note 15: Drafting DCOs, provide clear justification within the EM for the inclusion of such provisions in the particular circumstances, including whether the views of any relevant authority or government department have been sought.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Article 8(a) and (c) both require consent from the regulator in line with s150 of the PA2008. Can you confirm that this consent has been obtained?</p>
Q1.7.2	The Applicant	<p>Articles 29(2) and 30(3)</p> <p>In your Response to Relevant Representations [PDA-008] you expressed a commitment to give 3 months' written notice of work on their land to APs within the Heads of Terms of voluntary agreement. Do you intend to make the correspondent amendment to Articles 29 and 30 of the dDCO [REP2-004]? If not, please give reasons for your answer.</p>
Q1.7.3	The Applicant	<p>Design parameters in ES Chapter 3 and Tables 2 and 4 of the dDCO (Sch 2)</p> <p>There are some inconsistencies between the ES and Tables 2 and 4 of Sch 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ES Table 3.1 identifies the maximum lengths of the offshore inter-array cables and interconnector cables as 325km and 50km, respectively. They are shown as such in dDCO Sch 14 Table 4 and also as a combined total figure (375km). However, in dDCO Sch 2 Table 2 the two parameters are shown only as a combined total (375km); • the maximum number of inter-array (67) and interconnector cable crossings (10) are set out as separate figures in the ES (Tables 3.19 and 3.25, respectively). Only a combined total (77) is shown in dDCO Sch 2 Table 2 and Sch 14 Table 4; • dDCO Table 2 identifies the maximum number of offshore export cable crossings as 14, however this is shown as 24 in ES Table 3.22; • dDCO Sch 2 R6(3)(b) provides, in respect of the onshore substation, that the highest part of any external electrical equipment (excluding lightning rods) must not exceed 12.5m above finished ground level and R6(3)(d) specifies that the total number of lightning rods within the fenced compound must not exceed 12m. These parameters are not set out in ES Ch 3 although other substation parameters are reflected therein (Table 3.34). Para 3.6.2.1 of the Design Principles document is consistent with the dDCO in respect of the lightning rods, however it identifies a 15m maximum height for the electrical equipment. <p>Can the Applicant correct or explain the inconsistencies?</p>

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.7.4	The Applicant	<p>Deemed Marine Licence</p> <p>Part 2 Condition 18(1)(d)(i)(bb) of the DML [REP2-004] states that a cable burial risk assessment will identify if there is >5% reduction in navigable depth. It refers to consultation with MCA and Trinity House. Table 1.13 of the Stage 2 SAC Report [APP-032] states that approval for any such navigable depth reduction is required. Does the DML wording need to be updated to reflect this?</p>
Q1.7.5	The Applicant	<p>Deemed Marine Licence</p> <p>Tables 1.84 and 1.152 of [APP-032] state that a Marine Mammal Mitigation Protocol and an Underwater Sound Management Strategy are proposed to secure measures for injurious effects and disturbance from piling, unexploded ordnance (UXO) clearance and some geophysical activities. These are to be secured in the dDCO [REP2-004] through Part 2 Condition 18(1)(hi) and Part 2 Condition 20, respectively; however, neither Condition refers to geophysical activities. Can the Applicant amend the conditions accordingly?</p>
1.8 Flood Risk and Water Environment		
Q1.8.1	Stuart Neil	<p>Update</p> <p>In its Response to RRs ([PDA-008], pages 328 & 329) the Applicant addressed comments in your RR [RR-078] regarding natural springs and watercourses. With reasons for your response, has this addressed your concerns?</p>
Q1.8.2	Rebecca Face	<p>Update</p> <p>In its Response to RRs ([PDA-008], page 293) the Applicant addressed comments in your RR [RR-068] regarding watercourses and flooding around the TCC2 area. Has this addressed your concerns? If not, please explain why not.</p>
Q1.8.3	Michael & Sally Leach	<p>Update</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		In its Response to WRs ([REP2-078], REP1-087.2) the Applicant addressed your submission about the Proposed Development's potential impact on your property's water supply. With reasoning for your conclusion, does this address your concerns?
1.9 Geology and Ground Conditions		
Q1.9.1	CCBC	<p>Landfall works</p> <p>You raised concerns [RR-009] that landfall works could affect the stability of the landfill site at Llanddulas Beach. Has the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations ([PDA-008], page 22) and NRW (A)'s (REP1-056, paragraph 302) addressed that issue?</p>
1.10 Habitats Regulations Assessment		
Q1.10.1	The Applicant	<p>Isle of Man Ramsar sites</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm whether any consideration has been given to the potential for effects on the following Isle of Man Ramsar sites (potential and listed) and the conclusions in this regard?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ballaugh Curragh Ramsar • Central Valley Curragh proposed Ramsar • Dalby Peatlands proposed Ramsar • Gob ny Rona, Maughold Head and Port Cornaa proposed Ramsar • Southern Coasts and Calf of Man proposed Ramsar • The Eyres proposed Ramsar Bullet.
Q1.10.2	The Applicant NRW (A) JNCC	<p>Screening</p> <p>Can the Applicant provide further reasoning to its statement that 'the likelihood of the Mona Array Area resulting in barrier effects for qualifying features of SPAs are low' (paragraph 1.4.6.25 of [REP2-012].</p> <p>Does NRW (A) and JNCC agree with the Applicant's statement and that barrier effects can be screened out?</p>

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.103	The Applicant NRW (A) JNCC	<p>Screening</p> <p>The ExA notes the Applicant’s commitment to assessing in-combination effects where no LSE from the project alone has been concluded in section 1.4 of the HRA Stage 1 Screening Report [REP2-012]. Can the Applicant provide such an assessment, where this has not been done within the HRA and identify the projects or plans considered.</p> <p>Does NRW (A) and JNCC consider that there is the potential for an in-combination LSE for any site/feature where the Applicant has excluded a LSE from the project alone?</p>
Q1.104	The Applicant	<p>Screening</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm that it has consulted with relevant nature conservation advisers for SPAs in Irish and Scottish waters and UK Marine Protected Area (MPA) that are screened for which a LSE has been identified.</p>
Q1.105	The Applicant NRW(A)	<p>Conservation objectives</p> <p>The Stage 2 SAC Report [APP-032] notes that condition assessments are not available for a number of SACs. Can the Applicant and NRW(A) confirm whether condition assessments have since become available/ are likely to become available during the course of the examination for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • River Derwent and Bassenthwaite Lake SAC • Solway Firth SAC • North Anglesey Marine/Gogledd Môn Forol SAC • North Channel SAC • Murlough SAC • The Maidens SAC • Bristol Channel Approaches/Dynesfeydd Môr Hafren SAC • Lundy SAC • Isles of Scilly Complex SAC

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.10.6	The Applicant	<p>Conservation Objectives</p> <p>The ExA will be considering the potential for adverse effects on European sites in light of their conservation objectives. Can the Applicant provide conservation objectives for all European sites for which a Likely Significant Effect has been identified.</p>
Q1.10.7	The Applicant NRW(A)	<p>Conservation Objectives</p> <p>The Stage 2 SAC Report [APP-032] identifies sites and features in unfavourable condition. However, the condition of SPA's/Ramsar's has not been stated within the Stage 2 SPA Report [REP2-010]. Can the Applicant and NRW(A) advise if this information is available?</p>
Q1.10.8	The Applicant	<p>Conservation Objectives</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm whether any qualifying features of the European sites assessed in the Stage 2 SPA Report [REP2-010] are in unfavourable condition and/or has a restore Conservation Objective (CO) target?</p>
Q1.10.9	The Applicant	<p>Stage 2 assessment</p> <p>The Applicant's Stage 2 SAC Report [APP-032] relies upon measures in an Offshore Construction Method Statement (CMS) to avoid adverse effects on Menai Strait and Conwy Bay/Y Fenai a Bae Conwy SAC. An outline offshore CMS has not been submitted and at present there is no separate marine licence for the cable corridor. The ExA therefore lacks confidence these measures have been secured. Can the Applicant provide an outline Offshore CMS, which encapsulates all relevant measures, can be certified within the DCO and referred to within relevant requirements</p>
Q1.10.10	The Applicant	<p>Stage 2 assessment</p> <p>The Applicant has stated that no sandwave clearance would take place within the Menai Strait and Conwy Bay/Y Fenai a Bae Conwy SAC. Can the Applicant provide assurances and demonstrate that</p>

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		installation will still be possible without sandwave clearance, particularly given the mobile nature of sandwaves?
Q1.10.11	The Applicant	<p>Stage 2 assessment</p> <p>Paragraph 1.5.3.9 of Stage 2 SAC Report [APP-032] states that site clearance activities will only occur outside of the Menai Strait and Conwy Bay/Y Fenai a Bae Conwy SAC. Section 3.5.4 of the ES project description [APP-050] implies site preparation is required across the entire application site. There is a small overlap of the SAC with the application site. Can the Applicant confirm if site clearance will be restricted in the Menai Strait and Conwy Bay/Y Fenai a Bae Conwy SAC, and if so how will this be controlled?</p>
Q1.10.12	The Applicant	<p>Stage 2 assessment</p> <p>The Applicant's Stage 2 SAC Report [APP-032] and Stage 2 SPA Report [REP2-010] rely upon measures in an Offshore Environmental Management Plan (EMP) to avoid adverse effects on marine mammal and offshore ornithological qualifying features. Can the Applicant provide an outline Offshore EMP to provide assurance that all measures relied upon to avoid AEoI are secured?</p>
Q1.10.13	The Applicant	<p>Stage 2 in-combination assessment</p> <p>Can the Applicant explain why Table 1.3 contains Minesto Tidal Kite and Molaris Tidal project in Table 1.3 as Tier 1 projects, but these are not included in Table 1.57. Similarly, TwinHub Floating Offshore Wind Farm is included in Table 1.3 as a Tier 2 project but is not included in Table 1.57. Can the Applicant confirm whether or not these projects have been included in the in-combination assessment?</p>
Q1.10.14	NRW (A) JNCC	<p>Stage 2 in-combination assessment</p> <p>Is NRW (A)/JNCC content with the projects included in the in-combination assessments as detailed in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annex I habitats – Table 1.21 and Figure 1.9 of [REP2-012] • Annex II diadromous fish species – Table 1.58 and Figure 1.9 of [REP2-012] • Annex II marine mammals – Table 1.154 and Figure 1.13 of [REP2-012]

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offshore ornithological features – Table 1.57 and Figure 1.21 of [REP2-010]
Q1.10.15	The Applicant	<p>Stage 2 in-combination assessment</p> <p>Meath County Council responded to the Secretary of States transboundary consultation under the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 [OD-021]. This identified two offshore windfarms applications (Oriel and North Irish Sea Array) have ES and HRA information available on their website. However, the Mona HRA states that only Scoping Report information is available for these two projects.</p> <p>Can the Applicant explain whether the information provided for these two offshore windfarms has any implications for the Mona OWF HRA? Can the Applicant confirm if it will be updating the in-combination assessment? (including the cumulative effects assessment?).</p>
Q1.10.16	The Applicant	<p>NatureScot</p> <p>In response to NatureScot [AS-024] submission can the Applicant:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> respond to problems with the quality of the application; and undertake an assessment on European sites in Scotland to accord with relevant Scottish guidance stated by NatureScot (particularly different thresholds for triggering PVA of relevant qualifying species from Scottish Special Protection Areas).
<p>1.11 Historic Environment</p>		
Q1.11.1	The Applicant	<p>Gwrych Castle Boundary Wall</p> <p>Provide an update on the status of the Listed Building Consent for modification (to facilitate construction traffic) of the listed boundary wall at Gwrych Castle including the prospective timeline for this application. If consent is not granted, what are the implications for the Proposed Development?</p>
Q1.11.2	The Applicant	<p>Archaeological Surveys</p> <p>In [APP-068], Section 5.6.3, concerning further investigation into the archaeological potential of land on parts of the Mona Onshore Development Area, it is stated that further archaeological investigations</p>

ExQ1: 13 September 2024**Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		have begun. Can you provide an update on progress and any implications for the outcomes presented in the ES.
1.12	Land Use	
Q1.121	The Applicant	Policy context Paragraph 7.5.2.6 of ES Chapter 7 (Vol 3) [APP-070] cites two authorities for assessing the significance of the Proposed Development's effect on soils. Please explain how you reached your conclusion in the final sentence of that paragraph.
Q1.122	The Applicant	Additional information In its WR [REP1-051] the Welsh Government identified 8 specific areas of additional information that it considered necessary in order to review your Agricultural Land Classification field survey. Do you intend to submit this information to the Examination? If not, please explain why you consider it is not needed.
Q1.123	The Applicant	Disruption to recreational resources In Section 7.8.5 of ES Chapter 7 (Vol 3) [APP-070] you say that there is potential for the Proposed Development to result in temporary disruption of six identified recreational resources. Can you succinctly advise on the likely nature, scale and duration of disruption envisaged?
Q1.124	Michael & Sally Leach, Mr & Mrs JT Owen	Footpath & PRow Diversions In its Response to RRs ([PDA-008], pages 243 & 256) the Applicant highlighted its proposals for management or diversion of footpaths and PRowS, and at Deadline 2 submitted an updated Outline Public Rights of Way Management Strategy [REP2-070]. If you consider these proposals to be inadequate, can you advise how they need to be supplemented and identify any routes that are of particular concern?

ExQ1: 13 September 2024**Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.125	Llandulas and Rhyd Y Foel Community Council	Potential impact on local community To what extent does the Applicant's response ([PDA-008], page 54) to the matters you raised [RR-035] address your concerns?
Q1.126	Lois Williams	Update To what extent does the Applicant's response ([REP1-011], pages 231-232) to the matters you raised [PDA-051] address your concerns?
Q1.127	The Applicant	Intensive dairy farms Referring to, as appropriate, Figures 7.3 to 7.6 inclusive of ES Chapter 7 (Vol 3) [APP-070] can you give the correspondent Landholding numbers for the three intensive dairy farming operations that you refer to in paragraph 7.4.7.10 thereof?
Q1.128	NFU Davis Meade Property Consultants G Lloyd Evans & Sons Any APs	Effect on farm holdings At Section 7.8.3 of ES Chapter 7 (Vol 3) [APP-070] the Applicant assesses the significance of the Proposed Development's effects on farm holdings during each of its phases having taken account of measures adopted in respect of Farm Holdings in Table 7.24 thereof. Giving reasons for your conclusions, do you agree with its assessment?
1.13	Landscape and Visual and Good Design	
Q1.131	The Applicant	Task lighting During ISH2 [EV3-008] and in [REP1-012], it was confirmed that task lighting would be used during hours of darkness for the construction of the Onshore Substation, and that task lighting was included as part of the MDS in the LVIA. <ul style="list-style-type: none">It is noted that Table 6.19 of ES Chapter 3 (Vol 3) refers to task lighting and the in [REP2-086] you state that this was assessed. However, the assessment of nighttime effects in ES Annex 6.4 (Vol 7) [APP-156] does not appear to refer to task lighting at all. Can the Applicant explain how or where this was assessed and update the LVIA accordingly?

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If assessed, did the task lighting (for construction) assume any upper or lower limits for intensity levels? • If not, do you believe that it would be appropriate to provide a limit to the lighting intensity levels for the task lighting required during construction at the Onshore Substation site?
Q1.132	DCC, CCBC	<p>Landscape Mitigations</p> <p>In the LIR, [REP1-049], it states that you would like to see appropriate and proportionate mitigation included and secured within the DCO application to address the additional cumulative effects predicted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you explain in further detail the form and/or types of mitigation that would be appropriate, specifically for the cumulative effects outlined? • Would these mitigations be included as part of the existing OLEMP? • Could offsetting via a Landscape Enhancement scheme be appropriate in this case?
Q1.133	The Applicant	<p>Effect on National Landscapes</p> <p>In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) (now National Landscapes), section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 places a duty on the relevant authority to have regard to the purpose of conserving or enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regards to the CRDV National Landscape, Can the Applicant provide comments on why it considers the relevant authority could be satisfied the duty placed on it would be complied with if development consent were to be granted?
Q1.134	The Applicant	<p>Access from Glascoed Road</p> <p>The onshore substation access is shown in Figure 3.21 of The Project Description [APP-050], and the permanent access is described within the MDS outlined in Table 6.19 of F3.6 [APP-069].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you provide any further detail on the route that the permanent road would take? • Can the access road be shown or overlaid on the Illustrative Landscape and Ecology Strategy Plan?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm if any landscaping mitigations would be required in the vicinity of the permanent access roads.
Q1.135	NRW, DCC, CCBC	<p>Assessment of Effects at locations around the Onshore Substation</p> <p>Do you agree with the assessment of the sensitivity, magnitude of impacts and significance of effects of the representative VP around the Onshore Substation provided in [APP-069], particularly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The assessment of magnitude of impact and significance of effects on Representative VP 1, 2, and 3, at Y1 and Y15. The reduction in the significance of adverse effects at these VPs after the implementation of the mitigations outlined in the OLEMP [REP2-084] and shown in the visualisations. Whether the mitigations shown in the OLEMP, and in the annotated visualisations included in the Response to Hearing Action Points (S_D1_5.3) [REP1-015], would reduce the operation effects from significant to non-significant for VPs 2 and 3.
Q1.136	The Applicant	<p>Viewpoints 2 and 3</p> <p>Updated and annotated visualisations were provided at D1 [REP1-015] for VP 2 and 3. These show the representative viewpoints at Year 1 in the winter, and Year 15 in the summer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explain if there would be any significant difference in the coverage and function of the mitigations between winter in year 15 and summer in year 15? Could there be any corresponding difference in the significance of effects as assessed for the viewpoints?
Q1.137	DCC, CCBC,	<p>Visual Effects on Denbighshire Memorial Park and Crematorium</p> <p>Are you satisfied with the Applicants response to the effects on users of the Memorial Park and Crematorium? [REP2-086], (REP1-016.17)</p>
Q1.138	The Applicant	<p>Views from Residential Properties</p>

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Section 6.5.7.6. of [APP-069] describes the views towards the Onshore Substation site from the closest residential properties, and the degree of harm experienced by these properties in terms of visual impacts. In light of the points raised in [REP1-086] can you:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe which ground floor viewpoints were considered • Describe what would be meant by ‘substantial harm’ in this context • Explain why it is considered that the property does not experience a degree of harm over and above substantial to make considering private views a public interest matter.
Q1.13.9	DCC and CBBC	<p>Landscape Visual Impact Assessment Methodology</p> <p>Concerns were raised relating to the methodology used in section 3.3 of the LIR. The Applicant has responded in REP2-086. Does this address your concerns?</p>
Q1.13.10	The Applicant	<p>OLEMP</p> <p>The maintenance and replanting period for deceased mitigation planting or tree is stated as 5 years in the OLEMP [REP2-084], section 1.8.3.,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the reliance on planting to reduce significant effects over a 15 year period, is 5 years sufficient? • In the instance where mitigation planting or trees needed replacing after five years, who would be responsible for it? • After 5 years, what mechanism would be in place to ensure that the mitigation planting and trees would reach sufficient maturity and quality as to fulfil the mitigation function as required?
Q1.13.11	DBC, CBCC	<p>Requirement 5 of the dDCO</p> <p>In relation to the Onshore Substation, the Design Principles Document [REP2-026] describes a number of design details - including layout, number of buildings, dimensions, colours, and materials – which would be approved by DBC should Development Consent be granted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you consider R5 of the dDCO to be sufficiently detailed? If not, how should it be amended and why?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you consider that you would have the relevant skills and resources to approve the detailed design in discharging the relevant requirements?
Q1.13.12	Design Commission for Wales	<p>Good Design Principles</p> <p>Does the Design Commission for Wales wish to make any comments on the points and principles outlined by the Applicant during ISH2 [EV3-008] and summarised in Section 9 of [REP1-010] relating to good design and the design review process for the Onshore Substation?</p>
<p>1.14 Marine and Coastal Physical Processes and Coastal Change</p>		
Q1.14.1	The Applicant	<p>Numerical Modelling in the Nearshore Environment</p> <p>NRW has raised concerns that numerical modelling conducted to determine the impact to physical processes caused by cable protection has not been carried out in the shallow nearshore environment in the event that cable protection was to be placed over the four trenchless drilling exit pits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can the Applicant provide further numerical modelling in the nearshore shallow water? If the Applicant does not consider this necessary, provide clear justification and demonstrate how the decision maker can be satisfied, in light of paragraphs 5.6.17 and 5.6.18 of NPS EN-1, that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Any potential impacts on coastal processes at other locations would be minimised - The Proposed Development would be resilient to coastal erosion and deposition, taking account of climate change, during the project's operational life and any decommissioning period
Q1.14.2	NRW (A)	<p>Trenchless Techniques</p> <p>Paragraph 220 of [REP1-056] states that the commitment to securing trenchless techniques in the intertidal area is not explicit enough in the MLPD [REP2-028].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can you provide a form of wording that would rectify this concern.
Q1.14.3	NRW(A)	<p>OLCMS</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Do you consider that the OLCMS [REP2-066] should contain an outline landfall monitoring plan for post construction monitoring?
Q1.14.4	The Applicant/ NRW(A)	<p>Sandwave Recovery Monitoring</p> <p>[REP1-056] reiterates NRW's request that sandwave recovery monitoring should be included in post installation surveys, particularly on Constable Bank which would support statements as well as to help inform future work. The ExA notes that the Applicant does not consider this necessary as no significant effects were to be predicted.</p> <p>Applicant:</p> <p>Paragraphs 2.8.83 and 2.8.85 of NPS EN-3 state, that where requested by the SoS, applicants are required to undertake geomorphological surveys both prior to and during construction and operation which would enable an assessment of the accuracy of the original predictions and improve the evidence base for future mitigation and compensation measures to enable better decision making in future EIAs and HRAs. Can the applicant provide further justification, in light of these paragraphs, as to why it feels this would not be appropriate in this instance despite the request by NRW.</p> <p>NRW:</p> <p>Monitoring would be undertaken to observe the effect of sediment transport and sediment pathways on cable burial as outlined in Table 1.2 of the Offshore in-principle monitoring plan [APP-201]. Would this address your concerns or could amendments be made to this to address your concerns?</p>
<p>1.15 Navigation and Shipping</p>		
Q1.15.1	Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA)	<p>Safety of navigation and search and rescue</p> <p>Would you like to comment on the Applicant's response to your Written Representation, as set out in Table 2.6 of [REP2-078], particularly in respect of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments to DML Condition 18(1)(a) [REP2-004] in relation to layout principles and whether the two lines of orientation are sufficiently secured (ref REP1-068.4);

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether the reduction in search and rescue capability as a result of the presence of the offshore array has been fully mitigated (ref REP1-068.6); • The requirement for radio surveys and whether amendments to the drafting of DML Condition 22 and/or any other DML Conditions are required to achieve this (ref REP1-068.7); • Securing provision of Automatic Identification System (AIS) and Very High Frequency (VHF) capability to the MCA with direct access to HM Coastguard systems (ref REP1-068.7); • Safety zones (ref REP1-068.14); and, • The rationale for 125m micro-siting of turbines and platforms and knock-on effects for achieving the 1,400m spacing (ref REP1-068.24).
Q1.152	CLdN RoRo Ltd	<p>Safety of navigation, search and rescue, and adverse weather routeing</p> <p>The Applicant responded to your Relevant Representation in Table 2.8 of [PDA-008]. Can you respond to the following questions, providing justification for responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree with the Applicant’s conclusion [APP-059] that whilst there would be a residual risk over the baseline as a result of the Proposed Development, all hazards have been reduced to As Low As Reasonably Practicable (ALARP)? • Do you agree with the Applicant’s conclusion that impacts on emergency responses (such as those to marine casualties) would be of minor adverse significance? • Do you agree with the Applicant’s conclusion that for both the Mona project alone and cumulatively, the impacts on adverse weather routeing would be of minor adverse significance? • Do you wish to make any further submissions on the shipping and navigation effects of the Proposed Development?
Q1.153	Stena Line (UK) Limited	<p>Effects on Stena Line operations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you wish to comment on the Applicant’s response to your Deadline 1 submissions, as set out in [REP2-078], Table 2.14?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you agree with the Applicant's position that the residual effects of the Mona <u>project alone</u> on Stena Line's commercial operations in terms of additional steaming time on the Liverpool to Belfast route would be of minor adverse significance (as set out in section 7.9.3 of [APP-059])? Do you agree with the Applicant's position that the residual effects of the Mona <u>project alone</u> on adverse weather routeing for Stena Line's services between Liverpool and Belfast would be of minor adverse significance (as set out in section 7.9.4 of [APP-059])? Do you agree with the Applicant's position that the residual effects of the Mona <u>cumulatively with other plans and projects</u> on Stena Line's commercial operations in terms of additional steaming time would be of moderate adverse significance (as set out in section 7.11.3 of [APP-059])? Do you agree with the Applicant's position that the residual effects of the Mona <u>cumulatively with other plans and projects</u> on adverse weather routeing for Stena Line's services between Liverpool and Belfast would be of moderate adverse significance (as set out in section 7.11.4 of [APP-059])? Is there any further mitigation that you consider should be adopted by the Applicant to further reduce the residual effects of the Proposed Development on the operations of Stena Line?
Q1.154	The Applicant	<p>Update on engagement with Isle of Man Steam Packet Company</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further to the summary provided at ISH2 [REP1-010], can the Applicant provide an update on its ongoing discussions with the Isle of Man Steam Packet Company in respect of the likely significant effects on adverse weather routeing? To what extent are the Applicant's assessment conclusions and approach to mitigation agreed?
Q1.155	The Applicant	<p>Marine Navigation Engagement Forum</p> <p>With respect to offshore vessel traffic management and co-existence with other offshore activities, the Applicant states that it has committed to continuing the Marine Navigation Engagement Forum (MNEF) in the post-consent stage [PDA-008], ref RR-019.5 and [REP2-078], ref REP1-072.8.</p> <p>Table 7.17 of [APP-059] states that this is secured through the Mitigation and Monitoring Schedule [REP2-030], however this appears not to be the case.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where is this commitment secured?

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the terms of reference for the MNEF in the post-consent phase? For example, what would be its role and purpose, how regularly would the forum meet, would membership change in any way and do you envisage a role for the MNEF in both the construction and operational phases of the project? • Given the prevalence of other offshore activities in the vicinity of the proposed array and export cable areas, does the detail of this commitment need to be more clearly set out in the dDCO or a secured management plan?
Q1.156	The Applicant	<p>Coordination with the Ørsted IPs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do you respond to the submissions of the Ørsted IPs that additional engagement beyond the MNEF is required going forward [REP2-104], section 3?
Q1.157	The Ørsted IPs	<p>Coordination with the Ørsted IPs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further to your submissions that additional engagement beyond the MNEF is required going forward [REP2-104], what do seek in terms of commitment from the Applicant on stakeholder engagement and coordination to address your concerns in respect of vessel traffic at construction and operational stages? • Do you wish to comment on the Applicant’s response to your Written Representation [REP2-078], ref REP1-072.7-8?
Q1.158	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative effects including Mooir Vannin</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has there been any change to the publicly available information about the likely geographical extent and environmental effects of the proposed Mooir Vannin Offshore Wind Farm since submission of the Mona DCO application? • If so, is any update to the assessment of cumulative effects for the Mona project, particularly in relation to collision and allision risk, necessary?

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.15.9	Moor Vannin Offshore Wind Farm Limited (MVOWFL)	<p>Cumulative effects including Moor Vannin</p> <p>The Applicant responded to your Relevant Representation in [PDA-008], Table 2.45, ID RR-045.7.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent do you agree with the methodology and conclusions of the Applicant's assessment of shipping and navigation effects, as set out in [APP-059]?
Q1.15.10	Moor Vannin Offshore Wind Farm Limited (MVOWFL)	<p>Cumulative effects including Moor Vannin</p> <p>The ES for the Proposed Development concludes that there is the potential for moderate adverse effects (which are significant in EIA terms) in terms of collision and allision when the Mona array is considered cumulatively with other plans and projects [APP-059]. This is attributed to risks arising in the 2.5 nautical mile wide route that would be formed between the proposed Morgan offshore array and the proposed Moor Vannin Offshore Wind Farm. The Applicant proposes no further mitigation of these effects because it assumes that they will be considered through the cumulative assessments to be undertaken for the other projects, most notably Moor Vannin.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can you provide any update as to the cumulative navigational risk assessment that you are undertaking in respect of Moor Vannin and any embedded or additional mitigation that may be adopted in respect of collision and allision risk effects?
Q1.15.11	The Applicant, MCA	<p>Cumulative allision and collision risk</p> <p>REP1-029 records agreement that "<i>Allision and collision risk hazards between the Morgan Array Area and Moor Vannin Scoping Boundary are unacceptable based on the findings of the Cumulative Regional Navigational Risk Assessment Appendix D (APP-098)</i>" (ref MCA-SAN.28). This reflects the conclusions of the ES, as recorded in [APP-059].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the implications of this finding in light of para 2.8.331 of NPS EN-3?
Q1.15.12	The Applicant, MCA	<p>Exceptions to the Critical National Priority presumption</p> <p>The Planning Statement [APP-186] considers the exceptions to the CNP presumption set out in NPS EN-1 para 4.1.7 but concludes that "<i>none of the above exceptions apply to the Mona Offshore Wind Project</i>".</p> <p>To the Applicant, for the avoidance of doubt:</p>

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is it your position that the likely significant effects on navigation and shipping from the project alone and cumulatively identified in [APP-059] (including cumulative collision and allision risk effects) would not present an unacceptable risk to, or interference with, human health and public safety? If so, provide further justification for this position. • Is it your position that the likely significant effects on navigation and shipping from the project alone and cumulatively identified in [APP-059] (including cumulative collision and allision risk effects) would not present an unacceptable risk to, or unacceptable interference offshore to navigation? If so, provide further justification for this position. <p>To the MCA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you wish to comment on these matters?
Q1.15.13	The Applicant	<p>Monitoring of shipping and navigation effects</p> <p>Table 1.5 of the Offshore In-Principle Monitoring Plan identifies the Applicant’s monitoring commitments in relation to potential shipping and navigation effects, as secured in Conditions 18, 24, 25 and 26 of the DML [REP2-004].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the event that the construction or post-construction monitoring of impacts on vessel routeing and safety found that the impacts were greater than those predicted in the Navigational Risk Assessment, what mechanism is there for adaptive management of the project to respond to those greater than predicted effects?
<p>1.16 Noise and Vibration</p>		
Q1.16.1	Michael & Sally Leach, Mr & Mrs JT Owen	<p>Noise & vibration</p> <p>In its Response to Relevant Representations ([PDA-008], pages 242, 243, 255 & 256) the Applicant signposted its assessment of noise and vibration and highlighted its associated mitigation proposals. This was supplemented by submission of a revised Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan [REP2-044]. If you consider the assessment and proposed mitigation to be inadequate, can you advise how they need to be revised or supplemented?</p>
Q1.16.2	The Applicant	<p>Glascoed Road</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Can you either comment on or signpost where you have considered the potential noise impact of construction traffic, both individually and cumulatively, on residents along Glascoed Road?
Q1.163	DCC CCBC	<p>Noise assessment & monitoring</p> <p>IPs expressed concerns [REP1-086] about noise impact assessment including baseline noise levels, assumptions used in modelling, applicable thresholds and the resultant magnitude of likely impact. Taking account of that WR and the Applicant's response in ([REP2-078], pages 115-136):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With reasoning for your response, do you share any of their misgivings? • What are your views on their stance on mandatory noise monitoring and the Applicant's response? • Do you agree with the Applicant's responses in respect of: concurrent and cumulative noise impact; and to the contention that the potential impact on the IPs' property have been underestimated?
Q1.164	DCC CCBC	<p>Policy context</p> <p>The Applicant addressed your point about the Noise and Soundscape Plan for Wales 2023-2028 in its response to your LIR ([REP2-085], REP1-049.86). With reasons for your answer, are you satisfied with its position on the matter?</p>
Q1.165	MR & KM Hussey	<p>Vibration</p> <p>Do the provisions of the Outline Construction Noise and Vibration Plan [REP2-044] address your concerns about vibration [REP1-086]? If not, please explain your conclusion.</p>
1.17 Offshore Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment		
Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology		
Q1.17.1	The Applicant	Intertidal Important Ecological Features

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>As an assessment on temporary habitat loss/disturbance of intertidal Important Ecological Features (IEFs) has not been carried out, can you confirm how no maintenance activities in the intertidal zone would be secured (during the operational phase).</p>
Q1.172	<p>NRW (A) JNCC NWWT</p>	<p>Significance of effects Table 2.36 in ES Chapter 2 (Vol 1) Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology [APP-054] presents a summary of the potential impacts, the associated important ecological features, and significance of effects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) If you disagree with any listed aspect including Applicant’s significance of effects, can you identify and provide evidence to justify your opinion. ii) If you consider any effect to be significant in terms of EIA, can you identify and advise on any possible and realistic mitigation measures to enable residual effects to be not significant in terms of EIA.
Q1.173	<p>NRW (A) JNCC NWWT</p>	<p>Cumulative effects Table 2.37 in ES Chapter 2 (Vol 1) Benthic subtidal and intertidal ecology [APP-054] presents a summary of the potential cumulative effects, the associated important ecological features, and significance of effects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) If you disagree with any listed aspect including Applicant’s significance of effects, can you identify and provide evidence to justify your opinion. ii) If you consider any effect to be significant in terms of EIA, can you identify and advise on any possible and realistic mitigation measures to enable residual effects to be not significant in terms of EIA
Q1.174	<p>JNCC</p>	<p>Marine Benthic Impact Assessment If you disagree with the Applicant’s marine benthic impact assessment, can you summarise your position. Can you also provide information and reference to any legislation including relevant projects to justify the need to distinguishing between the inshore (within 12nm) and offshore (beyond 12nm) to assess marine benthic impacts. (JNCC RR-033.3 response to relevant representation [REP2-097]).</p>

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.17.5	The Applicant	<p>JNCC D2 submissions</p> <p>Can you summarise your approach to resolve JNCC benthic ecology comments and concerns received at Deadline 2 [REP2-097].</p>
Q1.17.6	The Applicant	<p>NPS EN-3</p> <p>Can the Applicant advise how it has satisfied paragraph 2.8.123 which states “The applicant should demonstrate compliance with mitigation measures identified by The Crown Estate in any plan-level HRA produced as part of its leasing round”.</p>
Q1.17.7	The Applicant	<p>Outline Landfall Construction Method Statement [REP2-066]</p> <p>Paragraph 1.10.6.5 states that the area of vegetated shingle bank associated with the Traeth Pensarn SSSI has been removed from the DCO order limits. However, your response to RRs RR-009.11 [PDA-008] states that some areas of the SSSI are still included in the Onshore Development Area to allow access to the beach.</p> <p>Can you clarify and describe any measures that could be put in place to delineate and protect areas of the Traeth Pensarn SSSI included in the Order Limits.</p>
	Marine Mammals	
Q1.17.8	The Applicant	<p>Can the Applicant summarise its approach to resolve NRW (A) concerns at Deadline 2 [REP2-099] that it has not calculated the number of animals disturbed from vessel noise. Can the Applicant undertake one of the two alternative approaches requested by NRW(A).</p>
Q1.17.9	The Applicant JNCC NRW(A)	<p>If scenario 1 involved excluding UXO clearance from the DCO and Deemed Marine Licence, and scenario 2 involved UXO clearance restricted to only low-order clearance charges; can parties advise if it would be supportive or not to either approach with reasoning.</p>

ExQ1: 13 September 2024**Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.17.10	The Applicant	Can the Applicant summarise its approach to resolve JNCC marine mammals comments and concerns received at Deadline 2 [REP2-097]
	Ornithology	
Q1.17.11	The Applicant	Can the Applicant summarise its approach to resolve NRW (A) concerns on its Offshore Ornithology Assessment of Pen y Gogarth / Great Orme's Head SSSI [REP1-037] received at Deadline 2 [REP2-099].
Q1.17.12	The Applicant	Can the Applicant summarise its approach to resolve JNCC ornithology comments and concerns received at Deadline 2 [REP2-097] Note: The ExA is considering D2 submissions, responses to its R17 letter (dated 15 th August 2024) and awaiting D3 submissions with further questions on marine ornithology likely to be raised during the Examination.
Q1.17.13	JNCC, NRW(A)	Are you satisfied that the site specific digital aerial survey (DAS) reflects Manx shearwater baseline characterisation. If not, can you provide evidence to justify your position?
Q1.17.14	JNCC, NRW(A)	Are you are satisfied with the collision risk assessment for Manx Shearwater and its conclusion. If not, can you provide evidence to justify your position?
Q1.17.15	The Applicant RSPB Cymru	Can you explain how the application considers the resilience of ecosystems and potential ornithology effects regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• displacement from foraging areas;• species energy expenditure;• impact on forage fish; and• ocean stratification (Irish sea) Can RSPB Cymru provide evidence addressing the four bullet points to demonstrate that the assessment has not fully considered indirect ecosystem impacts and also whether it would change any conclusions related to significance of effects.

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.17.16	The Applicant	The latest status assessment of breeding seabird species in the United Kingdom was published on the 2 September 2024 with the Arctic Tern, Leach’s Storm-petrel, Common Gull, Great Black-backed Gull and Great Skua added to the UK Red list. Can the Applicant advise if this affects its ES/HRA?
1.18 Onshore Biodiversity, Ecology and Natural Environment		
Q1.18.1	The Applicant	OLEMP [REP2-034] Paragraphs 1.6.1.3-1.6.1.12 identify technical roles and secondary management approach associated with the construction stage. Can the Applicant advise what the management approach and technical roles would be for the onsite preparation stage.
Q1.18.2	The Applicant	OLEMP [REP2-034] The design principles for biodiversity enhancement refers to management and enhancement of the nature conservation value of the Mona Onshore Development Area. Can you summarise what criteria was used to show that new woodland, ponds, grassland and hedgerow enhances the nature conservation area. For example, were any specific ratios used to show that habitats have been enhanced and have any of these ratios been agreed with DCC, CCBC, and NRW(A)?
Q1.18.3	The Applicant	OLEMP [REP2-034] Can you advise how permanent habitat loss compensated with new planting (using suitable native species) to provide new habitat with at least equal ecological value would enhance the nature conservation value of the Proposed Development area?
Q1.18.4	The Applicant	OLEMP [REP2-034] Can the Applicant provide a table listing all Habitats of Principal Importance that would be lost, permanently and temporarily, alongside the total area of proposed mitigation for each?
Q1.18.5	The Applicant	OLEMP [REP2-034] Can you advise how measures shown on plots 15 & 16 on the illustrative landscape and ecology strategy plan Figure 1.4 would affect the St Asaph Solar Farm shown on Figure 4.2 in Chapter 4: Onshore and intertidal ornithology [APP-067]
Q1.18.6	The Applicant	Onshore - OLEMP [REP2-034]

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Paragraph 1.8.1.4 relates to commitments relevant to woodland within the Proposed Development area. Can you confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) when would planting be undertaken and whether this would be prior to habitat loss and, if not why not; ii) the ancient semi-natural woodlands identified for expansion and whether adjacent land would require measure to address soil fertility and weed control; iii) whether areas of woodland including ancient semi-natural woodlands would require an extended monitoring and maintenance period to reflect natural regeneration and whether any measures are required during the decommissioning phase; and iv) if any assessment has been undertaken on nurseries suppliers and their capacity to provide locally sourced seed and plants.
Q1.187	The Applicant	<p>OLEMP [REP2-034]</p> <p>Paragraph 1.8.1.5 relates to commitments relevant to each habitat. Can you confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) your approach to temporary gaps between hedgerows during site preparation, and during construction; ii) where land is to be returned to landowner, how good ground cover (suitable as foraging habitat for GCN and reptiles) would be secured; and iii) where land is to be returned to the landowner, how would a reduced grazing regime (to create a longer more tussocky sward) be secured.
Q1.188	DCC, CCBC, NRW (A) RSPB Cymru NWWT	<p>OLEMP [REP2-034]</p> <p>Are you satisfied with the Applicant's onshore/landfall approach to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) habitats - mitigation, management, and monitoring; and ii) protected species – mitigation, management, and monitoring. <p>If not, can you provide reasons with supporting evidence to justify your position.</p>
Q1.189	The Applicant	<p>OLEMP [REP2-034]</p>

ExQ1: 13 September 2024**Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Can the Applicant describe its approach to immediate alternative roost sites where it is not practicable to install long-lasting woodcrete bat boxes and whether this approach would be prior to site preparation instead of prior to construction?
Q1.18.10	The Applicant	OLEMP [[REP2-034] For new planted areas of habitats the OLEMP refers to a maintenance period of five years. Can the Applicant confirm if the five years is a rolling period i.e. if a new planted area fails in year four, would this in effect be year one, with a further five years maintenance period to follow?
Q1.18.11	The Applicant	OLEMP [REP2-034] Can the Applicant provide further evidence to justify why it does not consider it necessary for a longer period than five years of maintenance for planted woodland area?
Q1.18.12	The Applicant	OLEMP [REP2-034] The OLEMP refers to appropriate use of artificial lighting. Can you explain where and how the potential impacts of artificial light sources during site preparation and construction, operations, and decommissioning were considered for otters and badgers?
Q1.18.13	The Applicant	Chapter 3 (Vol 3) Onshore ecology [APP-066] Table 3.22 states that the project has been designed to avoid areas of ancient woodland. Measures would be put in place to ensure that a minimum 15 m buffer is retained between ancient woodland and construction areas. However, the justification column states it would limit disturbance activity at the ancient woodland edges. Can the Applicant clarify if the measures to be put in place would avoid disturbance, or limit disturbance, at ancient woodland edges.
Q1.18.14	The Applicant	Chapter 3 (Vol 3) Onshore ecology [APP-066]

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Table 3.23: IEFs taken forward into the assessment lists ancient woodland having a national value. Table 3.17: Summary of Important Ecological Features lists ancient woodland having a county value. Can the Applicant explain the reason for the two different values?
Q1.18.15	The Applicant	Chapter 3 (Vol 3) Onshore ecology [APP-066] Table 3.23: IEFs taken forward into the assessment lists hedgerow having a county value. Table 3.17: Summary of Important Ecological Features lists hedgerow having a national value. Can the Applicant explain the reason for the two different values?
Q1.18.16	The Applicant	Chapter 3 (Vol 3) Onshore ecology [APP-066] Table 3.23: IEFs taken forward into the assessment lists Great Crested Newts having a national value. Table 3.17: Summary of Important Ecological Features lists Great Crested Newts having a county value. Can the Applicant explain the reason for the two different values?
Q1.18.17	The Applicant	Chapter 3 (Vol 3) Onshore ecology [APP-066] Table 3.23: IEFs taken forward into the assessment lists Terrestrial invertebrates as having a district value. Table 3.17: Summary of Important Ecological Features lists Terrestrial invertebrates having a local value. Can the Applicant explain the reason for the two different values?
Q1.18.18	The Applicant	Chapter 3 (Vol 3) Onshore ecology [APP-066] Paragraph 3.6.2.9 lists geographical scales but does not refer to district. Can you advise on the value of district?
Q1.18.19	The Applicant	Chapter 3 (Vol 3) Onshore ecology [APP-066] Can the Applicant advise how it has considered the effects of Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) Emissions on ecological receptors for project alone and cumulative with other projects?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.18.20	The Applicant	<p>Chapter 3 (Vol 3) Onshore ecology [APP-066]</p> <p>Table 3.9 stated the impact of temporary and permanent habitat loss on protected habitats and species during operations and maintenance of the Mona Offshore Wind Project has been scoped out. This was agreed in the Planning Inspectorate's Scoping Opinion.</p> <p>The Design Principles [APP-189] identifies total permanent land requirement for the Mona Onshore Substation to the perimeter fence as 65,000 m2. For the onshore substation site and during operation, can the Applicant summarise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the effects this permanent land loss would have on biodiversity, wildlife corridors and fragmentation; ii) what measures have been incorporated to conserve and enhance biodiversity; and iii) how the resilience of ecosystems would be in a better state at the onshore substation location.
Q1.18.21	CCBC	<p>Animal Health</p> <p>In your RR [RR-009] you say that the potential impacts of heat radiation on animal health requires assessment. Is your concern limited to livestock? If not, please explain what you were referring to.</p>
Q1.18.22	The Applicant	<p>Animal Health</p> <p>Further to your response to the LIR ([REP2-085], REP1-049.48), can the Applicant explain how the sensitivity of the receptor parameter [in APP-078] can be applied to animal health.</p>
Q1.18.23	The Applicant	<p>Trees, Woodlands and Hedgerows</p> <p>Can the Applicant provide a table listing habitats such as trees, ancient trees, veteran trees, woodlands, and hedgerows, and indicate total quantities related to length/number/area for temporary loss, permanent loss, replacement and enhancement.</p>
Q1.18.24	The Applicant	<p>Applicant's response to LIR</p> <p>In your response to REP1-049.110 [REP2-085] you confirmed that you had commissioned an outline feasibility report which has assessed the suitability of trenchless techniques for the drill below Gwrych</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Castle Wood. Can the Applicant advise if this report would be submitted into the Examination at Deadline 3, and if not, explain why.
Q1.18.25	The Applicant	<p>Applicant’s response to Welsh Government</p> <p>In your response to Welsh Government’s Written Representation reference REP1-052.14 [REP2-079] you state that every effort has been made to minimise the loss of veteran trees. However, paragraph 3.9.2.26 magnitude of impact, Chapter 3 (Vol 3) Onshore ecology [APP-066] states “...no veteran trees will be lost...”. Can you please clarify whether the Proposed Development would result in the loss of any veteran trees.</p>
<p>1.19 Other Offshore Infrastructure and Activities</p>		
Q1.19.1	The Applicant	<p>Potential wake effects</p> <p>The ExA notes the Applicant’s rationale for scoping out wake effects from its assessment of effects on other sea users [APP-062] [PDA-008] [REP2-078]. However, the Ørsted IPs [REP1-072] [REP2-104] maintain that the Applicant should undertake an assessment of the effects of the Proposed Development on the energy yields of other developments in the East Irish Sea, and if required provide suitable mitigation. This is a matter also raised by Scottish Power Renewables (WODS) Ltd (SPR WODS) [RR-074].</p> <p>Table 10.10 of [APP-062] indicates that all of the operational projects represented by the Ørsted IPs and SPR WODS are over 30km from the proposed Mona array area but identifies other operational, consented and proposed offshore wind projects which would be closer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having regard to the provisions of paras 2.8.197-198 of NPS EN-3 and the particular circumstances of this case, the ExA requests that the Applicant undertakes an assessment of potential wake effects on other operational and consented offshore wind farms in the vicinity of the Proposed Development. At Deadline 3, can the Applicant set out a timeframe for the completion and submission into the Examination of this assessment, which must be by Deadline 6 at the latest (and earlier if possible) in order to allow an opportunity for other IPs to comment on the findings.

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.192	The Applicant	<p>Potential wake effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respond to submissions from the Ørsted IPs [REP1-072] that consideration of the potential effect on the energy yield of other operational offshore wind farms is not just an economic matter but also one of good design (for example in respect of para 2.5.2 of NPS EN-3) and is relevant to considerations of the climate change benefit of the Proposed Development. Submit a copy of the 2023 Frazer-Nash study referred to in Section 10.5 of [APP-062], [PDA-008] and [REP2-078].
Q1.193	Barrow Offshore Wind Limited Burbo Extension Limited Walney Extension Limited Morecambe Wind Limited Walney (UK) Offshore Windfarms Limited Ørsted Burbo (UK) Limited (collectively “the Ørsted IPs”) and Scottish Power Renewables (WODS) Ltd	<p>Potential wake effects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you agree that Table 10.10 of [APP-062] accurately reflects the approximate distances between the proposed Mona array area and the operational wind farms that you represent? Noting that all of the operational wind farms that you represent are at least 30km away from the proposed Mona array area, how do you respond to the Applicant’s statement that based on the findings of the 2023 Frazer-Nash study, wake effects become “<i>vanishingly small</i>” when there is a farm-to-farm separation of more than 20km? Do you wish to provide any evidence of material wake effects being discernible at farm-to-farm separation distances of 30km or greater? Based on the internal modelling referred to in para 1.18 of [REP1-072], do the Ørsted IPs have concerns about all of the operational projects that they represent, or do they contend that the effects would be more pronounced for particular operational projects?
Q1.194	The Ørsted IPs The Applicant	<p>Potential wake effects – DCO Requirement</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>In the event that no wake assessment was undertaken during the Examination, the Ørsted IPs refer to Requirement 25 of The Awel y Mor Offshore Wind Farm Order 2023 which is focussed on the interaction with Rhyl Flats Wind Farm in light of its geographical proximity. The ExA is clear that any such Requirement would need to meet the relevant legal and policy tests and would introduce an additional pre-construction approval responsibility upon the Secretary of State. As such it should only be considered as a last resort and if supported by substantive evidence.</p> <p>To the Ørsted IPs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On what basis do you consider that such a Requirement would be justified in this case? <p>To the Applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noting your position [REP2-078] that such a Requirement would be unnecessary, do you wish to make any further submissions on this matter?
Q1.195	Microsoft Ireland Operations Limited	<p>Proposed Microsoft submarine telecommunications cable</p> <p>Further to [REP1-069], provide the following additional details about the proposed submarine telecommunications cable project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What consents / licences are required for the implementation of the proposed project? • What are the anticipated timescales for securing the necessary consents and for construction of the proposed project? • What information exists in the public domain about the proposed project and its likely environmental effects? • Do you wish to comment on the Applicant’s response to your Written Representation, as set out in Table 2.7 of [REP2-078]?
Q1.196	The Applicant	<p>Proposed Microsoft submarine telecommunications cable</p> <p>With reference to [REP1-069]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has this proposed project been included in the assessment of cumulative effects? If not, does it need to be added to [APP-084] and assessed for the relevant ES topic chapters?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline any engagement with Microsoft that has taken place or is planned in respect of the proposed telecommunications cable. • Is an offshore crossing and proximity agreement required in relation to the proposed cable?
Q1.197	The Applicant Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Limited	<p>Co-operation or co-existence agreement</p> <p>Further to [RR-046] and [PDA-008] section 2.46, can the Applicant and Morecambe Offshore Wind Farm Limited provide an update on their discussions regarding potential cumulative effects and the principle (and if relevant, function and form) of a co-operation or co-existence agreement between the projects?</p>
Q1.198	Menna Jones	<p>Potential effects on recreational sailing</p> <p>The Applicant's assessment of effects on recreational sailing is presented in Section 10.9.2 of [APP-062]. Table 10.16 of the same document sets out the measures proposed to be adopted to avoid, reduce or mitigate potential adverse effects. The assessment concludes that there would be a minor adverse effect due to displacement of recreational activities (including sailing) as a result of the Proposed Development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you wish to comment on these findings or make any further submissions on your particular interest in this matter?
<p>1.20 Seascape and Visual Resources</p>		
Q1.20.1	NRW (A)	<p>Seascape, Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (SLVIA)</p> <p>In [RR-011], paragraph 3.1.2.5, you outline that there are methodological and presentational issues with the visualisations and figures within the SLVIA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could you describe these issues in more detail? • Provide specific examples of where visualisations and/or photography are unsuitable or not presented in accordance with best practice guidance. • Comment on the Applicant's response provided in paragraph 1.2.4, [PDA-012].

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.202	NRW (A)	<p>Magnitude of change</p> <p>In [REP-1-056] paragraphs 360 and 361, you describe the implication of the ratio between the heights of the turbines and the distance from them for a 364m blade-tip height – as outlined in NRW Evidence <i>NRW Report No 315</i>. This determines the likelihood of the magnitude of change and overall effects.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the determination of the likelihood of effects and their level based upon only the ratios described, or is an element of judgement required? • Would the magnitude of change and overall effect as informed by the ratios described also depend on other features, obstacles, or landscape characteristics?
Q1.203	NRW (A) The Applicant	<p>Visual effects</p> <p>In [REP1-056] Annexe B, paragraph 367, referring to guidance from NRW’s evidence base, it states that “The array is not located ‘beyond the limit of negligible visual effects, particularly for the highest sensitivity area National Parks/AONB’s overlaid with heritage coasts”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does NRW consider to be the limit of negligible visual effects for the IoANL ,ENP and the CRDV National Landscape? • What is The Applicant’s view on this?
Q1.204	NRW (A)	<p>Additional information</p> <p>To what extent does the Applicant’s response in [PDA-012] address your points raised in [RR-011], paragraph 3.1.2.6, concerning additional information requested in the PEIR response?</p>
Q1.205	NRW (A)	<p>Response to RRs</p> <p>To what extent does the Applicant’s response in [PDA-012] address your points raised in [RR-011], paragraph 3.1.2.7, concerning cumulative wireline visualisations, relevant viewpoints, and the inclusion of the Mona Onshore Substation Awel Y Mor substation and other Tier 1 Developments?</p>
Q1.206	NRW (A)	<p>SLVIA viewpoints</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		In [REP-1-056] paragraph 374, you state that “Existing offshore wind farms are either not visible from or have a negligible impact on the majority of SLVIA viewpoints”. Would this still be true after the construction of the Awel Y Mor Offshore Wind Farm?
Q1.20.7	The Applicant	<p>Design Life</p> <p>In [REP1-056] paragraph 388, NRW state that “Whilst the ‘<i>design life of the Mona Offshore Wind Project is likely to be 35 years</i>’ [Paragraph 1.4.1.2, APP-048] repowering/replacing the turbines within the 60-year lease period is reasonably likely”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you comment on the likelihood of replacement of the turbines in the 60-year lease period? • Are the visual impacts that could occur within this period as a result of any turbine replacement still considered to be reversible?
Q1.20.8	The Applicant	<p>Statutory Designated Landscapes</p> <p>Can the Applicant respond to the points raised by NRW in [REP1-056], sections 1.4 to 1.12, concerning the SLVIA and the assessment of effects on the special characteristics and settings of statutory designated landscapes and receptors within those landscapes?</p>
Q1.20.9	DCC CCBC	<p>SVLIA</p> <p>In the LIR [REP1-049], section 3.3, you have provided a review of the SLVIA, but have not listed ES Chapter 8 (Vol 2) amongst the documents reviewed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the review concern both the offshore and onshore elements of the SLVIA, or onshore elements only? • Was a review undertaken of [APP-060]? • If yes, do you have any comments on the assessment or conclusions reached, or on NRW’s WR [REP1-056], concerning the assessment of effects (including cumulative effects) of the Mona Offshore array on the special characteristics and settings of statutory designated landscapes and receptors within those landscapes?
Q1.20.10	NRW (A)	Enhancement and offsetting measures

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>In [REP1-056] paragraph 386, you state that you consider that the “Mona array would cause significant adverse effects on the loA NL and the ENP”, and that “If the Applicant cannot mitigate these effects, they should provide offsetting/enhancement measures”. It is also suggested that a proportionate enhancement scheme for the loA NL and ENP should be provided to compensate for adverse effects consent were to be granted. Are there any specific enhancement or offsetting measures or projects that you would propose?</p>
Q1.20.11	The Applicant NRW (A)	<p>Landscape enhancement scheme</p> <p>R24 of the AyM Offshore Wind Farm DCO secures a landscape enhancement scheme which would include measures to compensate for the impact on the loANL, ENP and Great Orme Heritage Coast.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would a requirement akin to R24 be appropriate for the Mona Offshore Wind Farm DCO? • If not, why not?
Q1.20.12	The Applicant NRW (A)	<p>National Landscapes</p> <p>In exercising or performing any functions in relation to, or so as to affect, land in an AONB (now National Landscapes), Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act places a duty on the relevant authority to have regard to the purpose of conserving or enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can the Applicant provide comments on why it considers the relevant authority could be satisfied the duty placed on it would be complied with if development consent for the Proposed Development were to be granted? • Can NRW comment on if the implementation of a suitable enhancement scheme as described above would allow the duty to be complied with?
Q1.20.13	The Applicant	<p>Offshore Lighting Levels</p> <p>Table 8.18,[APP-060], describes measures taken concerning aviation lighting to reduce the impacts and effects of the Mona Offshore Wind Farm project. It is stated that lighting levels may rise to 2000 Candelas for poor visibility weather conditions, and that “Lighting levels are secured as a Requirement of the Draft DCO”. However, R3 of the dDCO, which relates to aviation lighting, does not specify lighting intensity levels.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you signpost to where the lighting intensity levels are specified in the dDCO? • If they are not specified, can you explain why? • Do the lighting levels described in the SLVIA also apply to the Offshore Service Platforms? • Does the assessment undertaken in [APP-060] assume a maximum intensity of 2000 Candelas? • Do the illustrative nighttime views shown in the SLVIA visualisations [APP-106], [APP-107], [APP-108], [APP-110], and [APP-111] show the brightest intensity or a lower intensity for clearer conditions?
Q1.20.14	NRW (A)	<p>Lighting effects on National Landscapes</p> <p>In [REP1-056] paragraph 416, it states that based upon previous experience, you consider that the aviation warning lighting for Mona Offshore Wind Farm is “expected to be visible from the northern coast loA and the impact on dark skies would not be negligible”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you provide further detail or information concerning what you consider to be the impacts of the aviation warning lighting on the dark skies within the loA National Landscape? • Can you comment on the intensity levels specified by the Applicant in Table 8.18 [APP-060] and how these would affect the loA dark skies?
<p>1.21 Socio-economics</p>		
Q1.21.1	Welsh Government	<p>Skills and supply chain opportunities</p> <p>Are you satisfied with the Applicant’s response to your submissions in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • skills and workforce [REP2-079], ref REP1-052.9; and, • supply chain development [REP2-079], ref REP1-052.12? <p>If not, what additional commitment do you seek at this stage of the project?</p>
Q1.21.2	The Applicant	<p>Welsh Language</p> <p>The Applicant’s submissions in [REP2-079], ref REP1-052.8 are noted.</p> <p>Can the Applicant respond to the recommendation of the Welsh Government [REP1-051], pages 5-6 that [APP-045] is assessed by an experienced language planning practitioner?</p>

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q121.3	Welsh Government	<p>Community benefits and local ownership</p> <p>How do you respond to the Applicant’s submissions on securing community benefits [REP2-079], ref REP1-052.5? Does this provide satisfactory commitment and if not, what additional commitment might you expect to see at this stage?</p>
Q121.4	The Applicant	<p>Community benefits and local ownership</p> <p>Further to [REP2-079], ref REP1-052.5, could you clarify your position in respect of local ownership?</p>
Q121.5	The Applicant	<p>Outline Skills and Employment Plan (OSEP)</p> <p>Section 1.2 of [APP-210] identifies opportunities for collaboration and alignment with OSEPs for other proposed projects being promoted by bp/EnBW. Can further detail be added now that the application for the Morgan Generation Assets has been submitted?</p>
Q121.6	The Applicant	<p>OSEP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst acknowledging that [APP-210] is an outline plan, can it include a stronger commitment that proper monitoring and evaluation of whatever measures become final commitments in the Skills and Employment Plan will take place, in order to measure the effectiveness of the plan? • Following finalisation of the Skills and Employment Plan, what are the mechanisms for ongoing scrutiny of, and engagement on, the Plan and should the OSEP include a firmer commitment in this regard? • What would happen if post-consent evaluation found that the objectives of the Skills and Employment Plan were not being met?
Q121.7	The Applicant and Isle of Anglesey County Council (IoACC)	<p>OSEP</p> <p>What progress has been made between the parties on the matters raised by the IoACC [REP1-023], ref IoACC.SE.13, in relation to the content of the OSEP [APP-210]?</p>

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q121.8	The Applicant	<p>Skills and Employment Plan</p> <p>Requirement 19 of the dDCO [REP2-004] provides that a Skills and Employment Plan must, following consultation with the relevant authorities, be notified to those authorities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can the Applicant explain why this Requirement seeks notification of, rather than approval from, the relevant authorities, particularly in light of para 5.13.12 of NPS EN-1? • Why is R19 contingent on the commencement of ‘onshore works’, rather than on commencement of the authorised project? • In the interests of certainty, can ‘<i>substantially</i>’ be deleted from R19(2)?
Q121.9	DCC, CCBC, IoMG and IoACC	<p>Skills and Employment Plan</p> <p>As named relevant authorities for the purposes of R19 [REP2-004], are you content that the Skills and Employment Plan would (following consultation with you) be subject to notification rather than approval? If not, provide suggested alternative wording for R19.</p>
Q121.10	Tan-y-Mynydd Trout Fishery Ltd	<p>Potential effects on Tan-y-Mynydd Trout Fishery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent does the Applicant’s response [REP2-078], Table 2.15, to the matters you have raised in [REP1-080] address your concerns? • Provide an update on negotiations with the Applicant.
Q121.11	The Applicant	<p>Potential effects on Tan-y-Mynydd Trout Fishery</p> <p>How do you respond to submissions by Tan-y-Mynydd Trout Fishery Ltd [REP1-080] that the business should be provided with a suitable legal undertaking or indemnity to protect its interests in the event that the proposed onshore construction works adversely affected the water source supplying the fishery?</p>
1.22 Traffic and Transport		
Q122.1	The Applicant	<p>Cumulative Effects</p> <p>The Council’s LIR [REP1-049] raises concern over the 1km study area being appropriate for the CEA.</p>

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you justify why a wider, more strategic assessment has not been undertaken in this regard? • Can you provide justification on the approach taken on excluding sites from the CEA where no information was available rather than making appropriate assumptions?
Q1.222	DCC CCBC Welsh Government	<p>Management of HGV movements and AIL</p> <p>Can you confirm that you are satisfied with the approach to managing HGV movements and AIL as set out in sections 1.4 and 1.5 of the OCTMP [APP-225]</p>
Q1.223	Welsh Government	<p>Protective Provisions</p> <p>Are you satisfied with the protective provisions in Part 6, Schedule 10 of the dDCO [REP2-004]. If there are any changes you would like made, please provide alternative wording and explain why it is considered necessary.</p>
Q1.224	DCC, CBBC	<p>dDCO</p> <p>In the LIR [REP1-049], you raise concerns over the disapplication of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. With reference to the proposed powers in Articles 10 to 15, Part 3, Streets of the dDCO, what, if any, amendments do you consider necessary and why.</p>
Q1.225	The Applicant	<p>Assessment</p> <p>The Councils' LIR [REP1-049] referred to two committed developments (46/2021/0159 PF and 40/2021/0825 PF) which have been omitted from the Transport Assessment. Can you provide reasoning for their omission?</p>
Q1.226	The Applicant	<p>Construction Port</p> <p>Can you provide an update on the port of origin for any deliveries to the substation or for the offshore works? If a port has now been identified, do any changes to the Transport Assessment or OCTMP need to be made?</p>

ExQ1: 13 September 2024

Responses due by Deadline 3: 30 September 2024